

Date: Wed, 26 Oct 94 04:30:15 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: List
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #506
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 26 Oct 94 Volume 94 : Issue 506

Today's Topics:

 NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins (3 msgs)
 Northern California Packet Police on rampage?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 25 Oct 1994 14:16:42 GMT
From: sww@csuohio.edu (Steve Wolf)
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins

pouelle@uoft02.utoledo.edu wrote:

:
: Extending this line of thought, and twisting it ever so slightly:
: If a packet bulletin addressed to CHESS is not amateur related since it gives me
: (an amateur radio operator) information from the author (another amateur - his
: call is in the header info) about a mutual interest is considered a bulletin
: since it is effectively addressed to all amateurs interested in CHESS and hence
: a one way communication, all that has to happen if for the originating station
: to receive one reply to the message to make it a two way (read non-broadcast)
: exchange! If this is not correct, the next thing to be "attacked" in this
: manner will be the net control operators starting the net. I have addressed
: messages to groups like HARDWARE and received a number of replies - as far as
: I'm concerned this is just another way to initiate the exchange of
: information between two (or more) stations and therefore allowed under Part 97.
:

A "CQ" is indeed defined as a one-way transmission in 97.111. It is allowed.

>

>I submit that both forms of the bulletin are the same. I end up with
>identical information. In both cases, the bulletin is an
>"informational bulletin". In both cases, the transmission is
>one-way. There is not an exchange between two stations. The form
>that the data takes is irrelevant. The mode upon which the data is
>transferred is again irrelevant.

I disagree. You have to do more than "tune in" to a packet BBS. You
have to establish a two way connection and **request** the information.
It's third party traffic pure and simple. Two amateur stations are
participating in information exchange.

>Then, what is the difference between:

>

- >1. My tuning in a packet BBS and reading an ARRL bulletin.
- >2. My tuning in a packet BBS and reading a bulletin about cooking.

>

>I again submit that both forms of bulletin are identical. Even a
>request (buried in the recipe) from a cook for more cooks to respond
>is nothing but a "CQ" and, again, a one-way flow of information.

Again, you do more than "tune in", you must **request** the
information. Unlike broadcast, you are an active participant
in the process. A CQ is not a true one way transmission. It
is an intergal part of establishing a two way exchange of
information. It's a solicitation for a response.

>If there is no difference, could W1AW begin harassing Clinton about
>his viewpoints on foreign trade (in their bulletins)? Could they
>discuss cooking or sewing? We must agree that the rules would
>prohibit such bulletins.

Yes, because they are true broadcasts. Anyone passively listening
gets them. Packet bulletins are fundamentally different in that
active participation is required.

>Because we use error correction causing a "connect" to be required does
>not change the fact that a packet radio bulletin is a one way transmission.
>It is not addressed to a ham. It is addressed to the ham community,
>to the general public, just like the W1AW bulletins. The changing of
>the definition of a "bulletin" due to the medium upon which it is
>transferred is not proper.

If you take this line, then you must squelch all roundtable and net
operations. Just like the packet bulletin, each station makes statements
to the participants and awaits responses from whomever is interested
in the topic. Packet bulletins are no different except that they are

not conducted in realtime. They are simply the packet version of the roundtable or net. If the topic of discussion is allowable on a net or roundtable, it's also appropriate for packet bulletins.

Bulletin is misleading terminology in this respect. The destination address header should instead be considered as a special interest group address, or as we call it here in netnews, a newsgroup. In other amateur use, we'd call it a net or roundtable. The key is that people have to "check in" to participate, on packet or on a voice net. It's not primarily a passive activity like listening to W1AW. With W1AW all you *can* do is listen, because they don't monitor the frequencies on which they broadcast.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 25 Oct 1994 15:31:23 GMT

From: myers@Cypress.West.Sun.Com (Dana Myers)

Subject: Northern California Packet Police on rampage?

I received an interesting letter yesterday. An "ARRL" imprinted envelope contained nothing but a photocopy of the Northern California Packet Association packet bandplan. The definition of "keyboard-to-keyboard" station has been highlighted in blue, as also "145.01 Keyboard-to-keyboard". A smaller blue tick mark is next to "145.75 TCP/IP". I get the impression someone in the Stockton area (based on the postmark on the envelope) had somehow noticed my PBBS on 145.01 and felt I should move to 145.75 since I happen to use WG7J NOS as my operating software. Sure, I support IP services, but the vast majority of my channel use is as a PBBS. PBBS *are* allowed on 145.01, according to the NorCal Packet Association plan.

I was mildly amused; I happen to live in Southern California, well south of what folks normally call "Northern California". 145.75 has not historically been a recognized packet frequency in our area. Yet, someone tried to tell me to move my PBBS to this frequency, citing the NorCal plan!

The best part? The person that sent me this note included no identification.

I've saved the NorCal plan for reference, but no changes are taking place in my station operation.

Have the Northern California packet folks decided to start rampaging on

other operators? Good grief! First we have someone open the Pandora's box of "digital bulletins" (which is all based on mis-use of the regs, by the way) and now I have secret police tacitly ordering me to change frequency! What is next? An 00 notice for operating packet?

;-)

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *
* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer *
* "Antenna waves be burnin' up my radio" -- ZZ Top *

Date: Tue, 25 Oct 1994 15:29:53 GMT
From: dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong)

References<kevin.jessup.51.002D3402@mail.mei.com>
<FiHNuc4w165w@lmr.mv.com>, <Cy6MMI.B56@wang.com>, <Cy7MvK.Gsx@utnetw.utoledo.edu>
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins

pouelle@uoft02.utoledo.edu writes:

>So you wouldn't be upset if I were to dedicate a packet BBS just to
>posting cookie recipes? How about developing packet news groups?
>Then the only poeple who would see the latest and by far tastiest
>cookie recipe would be amateurs who wanted it. Oh, I forgot - you
>can do that now, just ignore the posts to cookie, recipe, ect. Maybe
>we should get the ARRL to propose to the FCC what topics are to be
>talked about on each frequency for each band.

I don't think that would be a good idea. I think you should be able to talk about whatever you feel like talking about. The same is true for packet, or any other mode. It's just that indiscriminately posting bulletins to every PBBS in the country about things that are not of interest to the general ham population is a waste of resources and annoying. Depending on the interpretation of 97.113(b), it might also be illegal.

Dave, KZ10

--

Dave Bushong
OPEN/image Recognition Products

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #506
